[29th November 1928

(c) whether the Government are aware that in the alleged temple there is neither mula vigraha or uthsava vigrahas nor a dhwajasthamba; and

(d) whether the Government are aware that it is not a place of worship resorted to by all the Hindus or any section of them?

A.—(a) No; but a contribution is payable under section 69.

(b) No.

(c) The Government understand that there is a mula vigraham of Sri Kanyakaparameswari but no dhwajasthambam. It is not known whether there is an uthsava vigraham.

(d) No. After due inquiry, the Hindu Religious Endowments Board is satisfied that the shrine in question is a place of worship open to a section of the Hindu public and falling within the definition of 'temple' in the Hindu Religious Endowments Act.

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—"May I know, Sir, from the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government whether the mula vigraham spoken of here is movable or immovable?"

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—"Notice, Sir."

Contribution to the Hindu Religious Endowments Board by Sri Lakshmi Chermakeswaraswami temple of Markapur.

*847 Q.—Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether contribution has been levied by the Hindu Religious Endowments Board from the income of Sri Lakshmi Chermakeswaraswami temple of Markapur in the Kurnool district;

(b) whether it is a fact that the said temple has no other income except tasdik allowance made by the Government from beriz deductions; and

(c) if answers to (a) and (b) be in the positive, whether he has any objection to exempt the said temple from the said contribution?

A.—(a) The temple referred to is presumably the Sri Lakshmi Chermakeswaraswami temple at Markapur. The Hindu Religious Endowments Board has levied a contribution from this temple.

(b) The Hindu Religious Endowments Board reports that the temple has other sources of income.

(c) In view of the answer to clause (b) above, the question of exemption does not arise.

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—"May I know, in regard to the answer to clause (b), what the other sources of income are that are mentioned there?"

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—"Notice."

Town-planning

Preparation of a town-planning scheme for Mangalore.

*848 Q.—Mr. J. A. SALDANHA: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether in each and every one of the various town-planning and town-improvement schemes sanctioned by the Government the schemes were

29th November 1928]

prepared after consulting in the prescribed manner the owners of lands and buildings in the area affected as required by section 11 of the Town-Planning Act;

(b) whether a town-planning scheme of block No. 10 in the municipal area of Mangalore was prepared and sanctioned after consulting the owners of lands and buildings concerned in the area affected, and if so, how;

(c) whether it is a fact that none of the owners were really consulted;

(d) what the main purposes of the scheme are, how they are to be carried out and at what cost approximately; and

(e) how the scheme referred to is to be financed and how the financial propositions have been worked out?

A.—(a) Attention of the hon. Member is invited to sections 9 and 10 of the Madras Town-Planning Act, 1920, which require that resolutions either to make or to adopt a scheme shall be published by notification for criticism.

(b) The block No. 10 Market Ward Town-planning scheme was called for by Government under section 12 of the Madras Town-Planning Act, and a notification therefor was published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*. No written objections or suggestions were submitted by the Council as required by section 14 (2) of the Act along with the draft scheme. The Government presumed that there were no objections or suggestions and accorded sanction.

(c) The Government have no information.

(d) & (e) A copy of G.O. No. 1304, P.H., dated 26th June 1928, which contains the information is placed on the table.[a]

Mr. J. A. Saldanha :—"May I enquire, Sir, whether apart from the notice required under section 9 or 10 of the Town-Planning Act, under section 11 persons affected were consulted?"

The hon. the President :—"That is asking for an opinion."

Civil Justice

Construction of District Court buildings at Nellore.

849 Q.—Mr. C. Venkatarangam Nayudu : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have repeatedly received representations from the District Judge of Nellore explaining the desirability of constructing new buildings on a suitable site for all the courts in the town;

(b) whether proposals have been received for the acquisition of a site in Darganiet for the construction of the court buildings; and

(c) what action has been taken thereon?

A.—(a) The Government are aware that the District Judge, Nellore, has made certain representations on the subject.

(b) & (c) The proposal for the acquisition of a site had to be dropped as such acquisition would have cost much more than the site by itself was worth owing to the existence on it of a building which would be of no use to the Judicial Department.

[a] Printed as Appendix VI on pages 528-531 infra